

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks.

**Decision on Appeal**

In the Decision on Appeal dated July 12, 2010, the Board gave a new grounds of rejection of claims 1-43 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Board *pro forma* reversed the outstanding rejection of claims 1-43 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Raley in view of Ishizaki.

**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-43 and 50 are pending of which claim 1, 33, 43 and 50 are independent.

Claims 1-43 and 50 stand rejected under 35. U.S.C. § 101.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 1-43 and 50 stand rejected under 35. U.S.C. § 101.

Independent claims 1 and 33 have been amended to recite, “applying, by a computer, different individualised usage rules” and “applying, by a computer, different rules to the data items.” Thus, independent claims 1 and 33 are tied to a machine, namely the computer, and are statutory.

Independent claim 43 has been amended to recite, “A computer program stored on a non-transitory computer readable media for instructing a programmable computer to implement a method of controlling the processing of data, wherein the data comprises a

plurality of usage rules for a plurality of data items, the method implemented by the computer executing the computer program.” Thus, claim 43 is not directed to signals and is tied to the computer executing the computer program. Accordingly, claim 43 is statutory.

Independent claim 50 recites, “programming, executed by the computer apparatus.” Thus, claim 50 is also tied to a computer and is statutory. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 1-43 and 50 under 35. U.S.C. §101 is believed to be overcome and these claims are allowable.

*Independent Claims 1, 33, 43 and 50 distinguished over Raley in view of Ishizaki*

Independent claim 1 recites “different individualised usage rules” and “wherein the measurement of integrity is a measure of whether the computing entity includes a trusted platform providing controlled and audited levels of privacy for the data items.”

These features are not disclosed by Raley in view of Ishizaki. Raley does not individually define different usage rules for documents but instead appears to treat all the documents equally. Furthermore, Raley applies a test to determine if a browser has a UI module. However, Raley does not disclose a measurement of integrity measuring whether the computing entity includes a trusted platform providing controlled and audited levels of privacy for the data items. Ishizaki also does not disclose these features.

Independent claims 33, 43, and 50 recite features similar to one or more of the features of claim 1 described above. Thus, pending claims 1-43 and 50 are believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 13, 2010

By /Ashok K. Mannava/  
Ashok K. Mannava  
Registration No. 45,301  
(703) 652-3822

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.  
11240 Waples Mill Road  
Suite 300  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)